



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/091,606

03/04/2002

Brad K. Winking

020375-005700US

7664

20350

7590

08/31/2009

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP

TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER

EIGHTH FLOOR

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

GOTTSCHALK, MARTIN A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3696

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/31/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/091,606

**Applicant(s)**

WINKING ET AL.

**Examiner**

MARTIN A. GOTTSCHALK

**Art Unit**

3696

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MARTIN A. GOTTSCHALK.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) DARIN J. GIBBY (Applicant's representative).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 20 August 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Primary reference: Ahuja; Secondary reference: Walker.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Met with Mr. Gibby at the USPTO. Applicant explained the invention in detail. Clarified Examiner's interpretation of prior art, particularly as it applies to the features of "real-time" vs. "batch" mode of processing. The aspect of the invention wherein it is determined which of "real-time" or "batch" mode would be used for processing was discussed as a possible area to add more detail via amendment.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Martin A. Gottschalk/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3696

/Daniel S Felten/  
Primary Examiner, 3696